THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.24681 of 2005

Date:20.12.2005

M.Shanti Priya.

--------PETITIONER

The Kakatiya University

---------RESPONDENT

ORDER:

The petitioner is a Post Graduate in Public Administration. In the year 2004-05, she has been selected and engaged as a Part Time Lecturuer in Kakatiya University (for short 'the University'). Her term ended with the academic year 2005-06. The University issued a notice, dated 11.08.2005, inviting applications from the eligible candidates to be engaged as Part Time-cum-Contractual Lecturers in the Department of Public Administration. The petitioner and several candidates submitted applications, and the interviews were conducted on 26.10.2005.

The petitioner states that she performed well in the interview and has been selected. Her grievance is that though there exists sufficient work load and she has been selected, the respondents are not issuing the orders of appointment. She also complains that the respondents have violated the guidelines issued by them, in the proceedings, dated 11.08.2005, in relation to maintenance of roster etc.

In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, it is stated that the University prepared a reserved list of Part Time-cum-Contractual Lecturers, for

engagement, in the event of necessity. It is alleged that though there exist some work load, at a time when the notice inviting applications was issued, subsequently there was substantial depletion of the same, on account of two factors viz., joining of the lecturer, who went on foreign assignment, and the closure of the subject of Office Management, on account of the fact that the students are not evincing any interest.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

It is a matter of record that the petitioner responded to a notification issued by the respondents and came to be selected as a Part-time Lecturer. While the petitioner alleges that the respondents violated the norms stipulated by them, in the matter of issuing orders of appointment to selected candidates, the respondents justify their inaction, on the ground that there does not exist sufficient workload. The grievance of the petitioner could certainly have been attended to, had it been a case where the respondents have appointed any person, other than the petitioner. They clearly state that no individual from the panel of selected Part Time-cum-Contractual Lecturers has been appointed so far.

The respondents have agreed to follow the roster, even in the matter of issuing orders of appointment to Part Time-cum-Contractual Lecturers. The petitioner states that she belongs to Scheduled Caste Category and that the next vacancy is earmarked for that category. This needs verification, that too when the necessity to issue orders of appointment arises. It is too early for this Court to record any finding in this regard.

Hence, the Writ Petition is disposed of, directing that as and when the necessity arises for the respondents to appoint or engage any Part Time-cum-Contractual Lecturer, in the subject of Public Administration, they shall follow the roster as indicated in Clause (6) of their proceedings, dated 11.08.2005, and if it emerges that the next vacancy is earmarked for Scheduled Caste

Category, the case of the petitioner shall be considered, on the basis of the marks awarded to her in the selection process. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

20.12.2005

Jsu